

THE NET AND POLITICAL SEGREGATION (THE POLARIZATION OF DISCOURSES OF ANTI *PANCASILA* IN TWITTER)

Muria Endah Sokowatiⁱ

ⁱ(Corresponding author). Muria Endah Sokowati. Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta.
muriaendah@umy.ac.id

Abstract: Ben Anderson stated media creates imagined communities through the use of images and vernaculars that perpetuate stereotypes to the audience. However, the use of social media makes this concept paradoxical. Nowadays, people tend to seek out social settings they prefer and cluster in communities of like-mindedness. Hence, the nation will grow more politically segregated. It results intolerance growing in political differences, which makes national consensus impossible. This research aims to show the segregation that emerges through the conversation in social media. Using Critical Discourse Analysis of *Twitter* discussion of Anti-*Pancasila* issues, I argue that ideological orientation turns into polarization which encourages people to reconsider the concept of imagined community. It emerges segregation triggered by the politics of othering through the practice of labeling and demonization.

Keywords: Political segregation, social media, discourse, demonization.

INTRODUCTION

Some studies mention that hoaxes and fake news distribution through social media is consequent on ideological segregation (Flexman, Goel & Rao, 2013; Colleoni, Rozza, & Arvidsson, 2014; Spohr, 2017). Bishop (in Spohr, 2017:151) reminded that people tend to make themselves part of the same-minded community. As a result, *nation will grow more politically segregated*. Controversial information discussed in social media, whether it is a truth (the state of being true), or justification (the action of showing something to be right), creates segregation.

Political events, such as general elections, clearly show the segregation. In Indonesia, since the 2014 Election, continued with the 2017 DKI regional election, and the 2019 Election became the practice of political segregation due to the strengthening of identity politics. This study aims to explain how political and ideological segregation took place in social media through 2019 presidential election setting as a consequence of debates based on ethnicity, religion and inter-group issues in social media.

In order to limit the topics in social media conversation, this study focuses on the issue of Anti-*Pancasila* discussed through tweets, retweets, and replies on *Twitter*. Various hashtags created, such as #2019TetapPancasila versus #2019TetapAntiPKI, or #PKIvsPancasila and #PancasilavsKhilafah indicated the debates among social media users about anti-*Pancasila* issues. This study attempts to explain further narrative wars built by the two hashtags. Using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a method, the result performs the contestation of discourses and politics of labeling behind the Anti-*Pancasila* issue. It answered my argumentation that the digital revolution has been driven public to grow more politically segregated.

METHODS

I used CDA to interpret the discourse of Anti-*Pancasila* produced in tweets, retweets and replies. This method positions the text as a social practice and to describe the practice of power relations. Fairclough (1992) explained three analyzes conducted in CDA: textual analysis, discursive practice analysis, and social practice analysis, described as follows:

- (1) *The Description Phase* focuses on identifying formal text properties. The investigation of meaning describes the dynamics discourse of Anti-Pancasila in Twitter accounts.
- (2) *The Interpretation Phase* investigates the relationship between text and interaction, or observing the text as a product of certain process, and the source of the interpretation. It is important to find the ideas behind the selection of certain texts to share.
- (3) *The Explanation Phase* observes the relationship between text and social contexts. It's important to analyze the social practice to see the sociocultural context underlying the text production.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Counter Ideology: Islam vs Communist

Some contents found contradicting Islam and Communism while discussing the Anti-Pancasila issue, like the following tweet:



Figure 1. @MardaniAliSera's Tweet

In his tweet, @MardaniAliSera, the opponent of Jokowi, showed the contradiction between Communism and Islam. He wrote that communist only used Pancasila as camouflage to degrading Islam. To strengthen his assumptions, in the second paragraphs, he built the collective memories about G/30S/PKI's incidents in 1965. Aidit served as chairman of PKI. He explained on how Aidit had claimed to be *Pancasilais*, but finally betrayed it. Therefore, he labeled Aidit as Anti-Pancasila. He made this incident in line with case happened during Jokowi's government: he blamed Jokowi hate Muslims and considered as anti-Pancasila. This attitude was like communists.

The term "communist" in the last paragraphs referred to president Jokowi and his coalition. As opposition, Ali Sera, accused President Jokowi as anti-Islam and opposed

Muslim. There were some indicators encouraged the opposition to label the government as anti-Islamic: Jokowi had criminalized *ulama* and made policies to dissolve HTI as an anti-Pancasila mass organization. It made no difference to what Aidit did, so that he equated Jokowi's government to communism. In his tweet, he also emphasized that Muslims actually supported Pancasila.

The tweet referred to the history of clash between Islam and Communism. Anti-Pancasila meant Anti Islam, and it was communist. The same idea was found in the following tweet:



Figure 2. Tweet from @TanYoana

@TanYoana used words in capital letters (Radicalism, Anti-Pancasila, and Communism) to emphasize the issue. Islamic organizations and party (HTI, FPI and PKS); and words connoted as radical Islamic movements, like "Wahabi" and "Khilafah" are also mentioned.

"Radikalisme" used to define ideology that struggled to change the social and political systems violently and drastically (Chulsum & Novia in Sinaga *et.al.*, 2018:7). The tweet placed this term parallel with other terminologies (Wahabi, Khilafah, HTI, FPI, and PKS) as if they have ideological similarities: Islam and equal to Anti-Pancasila. Placing Islam and Anti-Pancasila (both terminologies are used to become contradictory) in a parallel sentence actually was a satire to the government. The word "Komunisme" in second sentence was contradicted to terminologies mentioned in the first sentence. It implied that Communism was the real threat, which referred to the government.

Both tweets positioned the government and communists at the same category that contrary to Pancasila. The other tweet with the same pattern performed as follows:



Figure 3. Anti-Pancasila's tweet from @UusRsd

If @YanYoana explained Islamic ideology represented by Islamic organizations opposed to communism, @UusRsd used PKI as a representation of communism. His tweet didn't contradict Communism with Islam, but positioned the government was similar to PKI. He mentioned book titled *Aku Bangga Jadi Anak PKI* whose author represented the government. Ribka Tjiptaning, the writer, was a member of PDIP, government coalition party.

The anti-Pancasila discourse associated with communism was constructed through tweets, retweets or reply from accounts supporting the opposition group. They put the government in line with communists implicitly by making analogy through Aidit, who accused Islam as anti-Pancasila; and representation, such as PDIP figures of PKI descent. This counter-attack on the government was a reaction to the comments of the pro-government coalition who stated *Khilafah* was Anti-Pancasila.

2. The Opposite Discourses of *Khilafah*

The government accusation of HTI and its *Khilafah* system as anti-Pancasila, had triggered discussion on *Twitter*. Some contents used the term *Khilafah*. This term was used by both pro-government and opposition accounts.



Figure 4. Tweet from account @TeddyGusnaldi

@TeddyGusnaldi mentioned “teroris khilafah”, which equated people supporting *khilafah* as terrorist, anti-Islam and anti-Pancasila. However, they acted as if they were Islamic and

pro-Pancasila. The word “mendadak” indicated it. Attaching anti-Islamic label to *Khilafah*, which became the enforcement of *Syariah* laws was interesting. It was motivated by the opposition groups claim that accused the government as anti-Islam due to its policy of banning HTI.

The same point of view described at @_54TRIYA_. Replying @AkunTofa, which displayed the pictures of Islamic organizations campaigns, he wrote the following tweet:



Figure 5. Tweet from account @_54TRIYA

@_54TRIYA_ stated FPI, HTI and ISIS supporters (troops) as anti-Pancasila and *Khilafah*. It was also stated “suka jualan agama”, which meant to use Islamic values as a tool to transform the *Pancasila* into *khilafah* system. FPI, HTI and ISIS are called racist and anarchists. All words were written with capital letters with 18 LOL (Laugh Out Loud) emoticon. It was an ethics violation in online interaction because capitalizing in online media means shouting or yelling.

@_54TRIYA_ judged *Khilafah* supporters had Islamic pretense, while @TeddyGusnaldi's stated that group supporting *khilafah* just a sudden Islamic group, which was also parallel to anti-Islamic. Both accounts labeled *Khilafah* supporters abusing religion.

Tweet and reply from @TeddyGusnaldi and @_54TRIYA_ as pro-government accounts contrasted *Pancasila* with *Khilafah*. Their expressions also emphasized that *Khilafah* was anti-Islam to counter of opposition group that accused the government was anti-Islam. For them, *Khilafah* meant anti-Islam.



Figure 6. Tweet from account @CH_chotimah

@CH_chotimah also confirmed the same thing. The tweet illustrated the same intention. It countered the accusations of opposition groups blaming the government as anti-Islam. She then called the opposition group as anti-Pancasila. They took advantage of Islam to claim outsiders who had different point of view as anti-Islam. The statement “Islam dijadikan tameng” was similar to the terms “menjual agama” and “mendadak Islam”. The tweet also mentioned the opposition group as PKI, interpreted as a counter of the claim that Jokowi was a descendant of PKI.

The accounts of opposition’s supporters also used the word “*Khilafah*” while discussing anti-Pancasila in order to show that *Khilafah* was issue produced by the government intentionally to marginalize Muslims. The following tweet from @NataliusPigai2 was the example:



Figure 7. Tweet from account @Natalius Pigai2

Natalius Pigai was a prominent human rights activist. Similar to HTI, he also became the supporter of opposition. Therefore, in his tweet, he didn’t reject *khilafah*. Instead of vilifying *khilafah*, he suspected CSIS, LB Moerdani, Hendropriyono, and anti-Islam group contrasted to Pancasila and *Khilafah* deliberately, as the strategy to attack their political opponents.

Twitter users responded the pro-government supporters claim that *Khilafah* was anti-Pancasila by constructing diverse discourses on *khilafah* adjusted to their interests and political positions. *Khilafah* was positioned as anti-Islam or even a political tool to attack Islam. For the opposition, there were no tweets, retweets or replies found in discussing anti-Pancasila, which explicitly defended *khilafah*. *Khilafah* was in the grey area for the opposition. They didn’t either defend or refuse because HTI was their coalition.

The term “*khilafah*” has neutral meaning. It has different meaning when it is put in the context of contestation. Its meaning has shifted when used or attached to certain group identities.

3.The Politics of Othering: Labeling and Demonizing

Both government and opposition supporters performed their endorsement for Pancasila as the state ideology. Each accounts supporting either government or opposition constructed their collective identity as pro-Pancasila. They put their position to distinguish opposing group’s position. It was the practice of othering, a core strategy to construct individual and collective identities (Tekin, 2010: 11).

Making labels attached to the opposing group is a good example of othering. The pro-government supporters attached labels: *radikal, intoleran, rasis, anarkis, ekstrim, penyebar hoax* (disseminating hoaxes), and *pemberontak* (rebels) to the supporters of opposition group. While the supporters of opposition group stigmatized the government supporters as *komunis, antek PKI* (PKI stooges), *penyebar tuduhan keji* (spreaders of vicious), *dungu* (stupid), and *panik*.

Each group labeled others to describe them as deviant, negative, dangerous, and considered as threat. The following tables describe labels used, both for self and other.

Table 1. Labeling Self/Us as Defending Pancasila

Categories of Label Group represented	Ideology	Attitude/ Behavior	Part of Organization
Pro-Government	-	Membubarkan ormas anti Pancasila	NU Banser Militar
Opposition	-	Muslim yang sholeh, Tegas, Toleran, Anti Korupsi	Bukan PKI

Table 2. Labeling Others as Anti Pancasila

Categories of Label Group represented	Ideology	Attitude /Behavior	Part of Organization
Pro-Government	Komunisme	Penyebar fitnah Panik Dungu Maling teriak maling Memecah belah	PKI
Opposition	Wahabi Khilafah Radikalisme	Penyebar hoax dan hate speech Pemberontak Tidak taat ulama Tidak menghargai TNI Pembela koruptor Intoleran Pembenci militer Pembenci KPK Pemfitnah NU	HTI PKS FPI Ormas anti-Pancasila ISIS

		Teroris Anti-NKRI Jualan agama Rasis Anarkis	
--	--	---	--

The tables show that labeling others as deviant is performed by accounts from both groups. However, for the supporters of opposition group attached more negative labels.

Polarization was unavoidable since each account attempted to distinguish between “us” and “them”. Labeling produced as polarization had framed “them” or outsiders in negative lights. It is called demonization. It comes from the word “demon”, as a concrete manifestation of immorality and what is bad (Befu, 2011:17). In a society divided into social categories, demon is a metaphor representing certain groups of people.

Some conditions become the target of demonization. When someone considered immoral, then he/she will become a demon. But the existence of a standard relativism of morality causes each group demonize to each other. They claim the bad other as the demon. It turns out the mutual demonization (Befu, 2011:24).

The tweets, retweets, and replies from account of the pro-government supporters gave different labels for the opposition group, and vice versa. It illustrated the mutual demonization practice. Each group accused to each other, giving each other negative labels that demeaned the outsiders from their own group. Outsiders who didn’t share the same cultural moral and codes were their political enemies, as the targets of demonization. Demonization becomes the politics of representing others as demons. Thus, demonic actions, according to Befu (2011) are a symptom of a sick society.

CONCLUSIONS

Segregation occurred as a result of difference choice of presidential candidates among *Twitter* users. Pro-government users built narrative of *khilafah* system supporters as anti-*Pancasila*. Meanwhile, anti-*Pancasila* discourse was produced by the opposition through communism and anti-Islam issues.

The words “*khilafah*”, “communist”, and “anti-Islam” were defined, narrated by each group in such a way to show the identity of their group and outsiders. The government supporters could accuse the opposition of being anti-Islam, and it is anti-*Pancasila*. However, the opposition groups would state the pro-government groups were anti-Islam so that they were anti-*Pancasila*. These terms may have different meanings when placed in the context of contestation. The meaning depends on the groups that use the words.

This classification is the first step to create hatred which is increasingly maintained through labeling, and further strengthens differences. The differences between two groups are continued and get stronger because it is reminded by labels that are easily recorded in the user’s memory. The feeling of difference continues. Users become proud of one label, and hate to other labels.

Hatred causes certain group demeaning others. Prejudice and generalization are constantly maintained. At this point, demonization is similar to dehumanization as the core of politics of othering. Social media was originally created to unite humans who are separated. Due to the politics of othering, it makes people segregated.

REFERENCES

- Flaxman, SR., Goel, S., & Rao, JM. (2013). Ideological Segregation and the Effects of social media on News Consumption. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 1–42
- Colleoni, E., Rozza, A., & Arvidsson, A. (2014). Echo Chamber or Public Sphere? Predicting Political Orientation and Measuring Political Homophily in Twitter Using Big Data. *Journal of Communication*, 317–332. doi:10.1111/jcom.12084
- Spohr, D. (2017). Fake News and Ideological Polarization: Filter Bubbles and Selective Exposure on social media. *Business Information Review*, 34(3), 150–160. doi:10.1177/0266382117722446

- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, Polity Press
- Sinaga O., Ramelan, P. & Montratama, I. (2018). *Terorisme Kanan Indonesia: Dinamika dan Penanggulangannya*, Gramedia
- Tekin, Bç. (2010). *Representation and Othering in Discourse*, John Benjamin Publishing Company
- Befu, H. (2011). Demonizing The Other. In Wistrich RS., *Demonizing the Other: Antisemitism, Racism, Xenophobia*, Routledge, 17-30